



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The "get together, brethren," which phrase I used in the last number, almost seems to have been prophetic in the light of subsequent developments. The Academy of Design and the Society of American Artists are on the point of uniting after thirty years of separation. The "Ten American Painters" also are to be taken into the fold, and a united body will come into existence which will facilitate the federation on a stronger basis of all the thirteen different art organizations, such as the Sculpture Society, the Architectural League, the Miniature Painters, and others.

Right on top of the announcement of this intended union comes the plan outlined by Dr. Nicholas M. Butler for a great school of fine arts in this city, which plan proposes a merger of the present art interests of Columbia University and the schools of the National Academy of Design, under the coöperation and aid of the Metropolitan Museum.

Surely, Union is in the air. Let the good work proceed and do not be restrained by the cavilings of chronic objectors. Remember the device of the old Dutch provinces: "*Eendracht maakt Macht.*"

\* \* \*

The exhibition of the pictures by John W. Alexander at the Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, has attracted deserved attention. Most of the twenty-six canvases shown are worthy of the artist's high reputation. His work always has distinction, is noted for flowing line and harmony of color, and is peculiar in the broad handling, dry surface and the use of a canvas of coarse twill. There is, however, no eccentricity or mannerism in his work, as the artist has a sane reason for his peculiar method. This recalls to mind a letter written by Mr. Alexander to an artist friend some years ago, in which he explains himself and which will be of interest to those who are curious as to his technique. I will quote the part of interest:

"The purest white mixed with the purest turpentine is very soon the color of tallow. I have now for at least fifteen years used nothing but benzine, which evaporates almost immediately, leaving the color as pure as it can be. I have gone one point farther and have all my canvases made without oil in the ground, and as porous as possible, to admit of drying, and I'll tell you exactly what that method is.

"I have been experimenting for more years than I care to admit, and it was an easy thing to prove that oil and varnish would soon darken, but I found also that turpentine would do the same thing. I have had no oil, varnish, or turpentine in my studio for years. Another point; my pictures are not so thin as they look. The actual weight in color would surprise you, but the effect of thinness is given by the heavy grain of the canvas, and by the technique, which consists mainly in rubbing the color well into the canvas. As you say, this does not affect the durability of a picture. Some of the most brilliant works by the old masters are hardly more than wash. It is the heavily painted picture that cracks."

There are champions of all methods, but artistic results, such as Mr. Alexander gives, is the only concern of the true artist.

\* \* \*

Mr. William A. Coffin has had on exhibition at the Clausen Galleries three of his latest landscapes, which mark new progress in the art of this meritorious landscapist. They have added subtlety and charm to his previous exploits. The tender color and distinct atmospheric quality make these scenes true counterfeits of nature.

\* \* \*

The well-known painter, George de Forest Brush, who for some time has been painting in Florence, Italy, has returned to this city to execute a number of portrait commissions.



#### THE TARIFF ON ART.

THE LEAGUE FOR POLITICAL EDUCATION,  
23 W. 44th St., New York City, April 21, 1905.  
David C. Preyer, Esq., Editor of THE COLLECTOR AND ART CRITIC, 489 Fifth Avenue, New York City:

Dear Sir.—I am in hearty sympathy with the efforts you are making through your excellent journal to promote the effort for the removal of the tariff on works of art. The Executive Committee of the League for Political Education, of which I am the Director, have voted that our League coöperate with all other organizations and individuals interested, in every way in our power, to secure the passage of the Lovering bill or some similar legislation.

The tariff on works of art is nothing less than a tax on good morals, good manners and civilization itself. This tariff is the most barbarous and utterly inexcusable and indefensible piece of legislation I know of in this country. A tax of this kind has no friends and deserves to have none.

As to the principle of a protective tariff, it is not necessary to say anything. The considerations involved in the general tariff question are quite different from those which apply to the art tariff. If, however, the friends of the tariff system in this country are so fearful that the slightest change in that system in the direction of making it more rational, more just and less a barrier to the development of culture in this country, would endanger the whole system, then the tariff fabric rests upon a very unstable foundation. Its strongest advocates ought to be the very persons to wish to have such an inconsistency and absurdity as an art tariff abolished so that the tariff system itself may not suffer reproach in consequence.

Yours sincerely, ROBERT ERSKINE ELY.

Brooklyn, N. Y., April 19, 1905.  
To the Editor of THE COLLECTOR AND ART CRITIC:

The remedy proposed by your correspondent, "B.," in your last number does not seem to me as practicable as the suggestion you made in the issue of April 1st: "To leave the duty of 20 per cent., as it is now, on all works of art up to the value of \$500, and charge a specific duty of \$100 on works of art above that value." This remedy cannot raise the ire of the ultraprotectionists, who have the whiphand, anyway, as the principle of protection (*sic*) is not assailed, while it removes the bone of contention, viz., that the best art is kept out of the country by exorbitant duty charges.

Very truly yours, J. H. S.

BOSTON, Mass., April 17, 1905.

To the Editor:  
DEAR SIR—Did you trip or was it a typographical error which I noticed in your last number? On page 74, 4th line from the top of the second column, you use the word *bijous*. My French grammar tells me of seven nouns, ending in *ou*, which form their plural by adding "x."

Very truly yours, X.

My Bostonian correspondent must soon purchase another grammar, for the French Academy at its April meeting decided that the seven words—*bijou*, *chou*, *caillou*, *pou*, *joujou*, *hibou* and *sapajou*, shall hereafter form their plural in the ordinary way, by the addition of an "s." *Bijous* is, therefore, correct.